REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claim 6 is currently being amended to improve its grammar without narrowing its scope.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-17 remain pending in this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Application Publication 2003/0032406 to Minear et al. ("Minear"). Claims 2, 6-9, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minear in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,752,041 to Fosdick ("Fosdick"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a telecommunications platform having a plurality of communications links of which only a portion of the links are enabled for use through the activation of a first base license key. The telecommunications platform of claim 1 comprises "a licensing framework for activating an upgrade license key to enable additional ones of the plurality of links." Minear and Fosdick fail to suggest at least this feature of claim 1.

Minear is directed to a system for licensing software applications over a licensing network. Minear discloses that upon the attempted execution of a software application by a user of a wireless device, the wireless device determines if a license is present (page 1, paragraph [0009]). If not present, the wireless device may receive the license from a application managing server, and install the license such that the software application is licensed and executable. Id. The transmission of the license can be a full copy of a license, a

partial copy, a key, or other object that can update an existing license or create a new license for the software application. (page 4, paragraph [0037]).

Minear, however, fails to disclose any licensing framework for activating an upgrade license key to enable additional ones of a plurality of communication links as recited in claim 1. The licenses of Minear are to allow the use of <u>software applications</u> on a wireless device. Minear does not disclose his licenses to be a license that enables <u>communication links</u>, much less one that enables additional communication links beyond that of a base license.

The Office Action cites to paragraph [0037] of Minear as disclosing the feature of a licensing framework for activating an upgrade license key to enable additional ones of the plurality of links. The cited section, however, merely discloses that the transmission of the license can be a full copy of a license, a partial copy, a key, or other object that can update an existing license or create a new license for the software application. This section says nothing about an upgrade license key that enables additional ones of a plurality of communication links. Once the wireless device in Minear receives a new license or means to update its license, the result is the same, the software application, such as a chess, golf score keeper, or stock monitor, is executed. The software, however, does not enable additional ones of a plurality of communication links.

Fosdick was cited for allegedly disclosing a traffic monitoring element, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Minear.

Independent claims 8, 15, 16, and 17 respectively recite "activating an upgrade license key to enable additional ones of the plurality of links", "a licensing framework for activating an upgrade license key to temporarily enable additional ones of the plurality of links", "a licensing framework for activating an upgrade license key to enable additional ones of the plurality of links", and "a licensing framework for activating an upgrade license key to enable additional ones of the plurality of links", and thus are patentable for reasons analogous to claim 1.

-7-

The dependent claims are patentable for reasons analogous to their respective independent claims, as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, Minear and Fosdick fail to suggest the features of at least dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13 or 14, nor would such features have been obvious in light thereof.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date _December 13, 2005_   By _____

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP   William T. Ellis
Customer Number: 22879   Attorney for Applicant
Telephone: (202) 672-5485   Registration No. 26,874
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399
                                   Thomas G. Bilodeau
                                   Attorney for Applicant
                                   Registration No. 43,438

-8-